

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 23 and 32 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support for the claim amendments may be found in the present specification at least at paragraph 35. No new matter has been added.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-46 are pending with claims 1, 23 and 32 being independent.

### **1. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6-26 and 28-46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Quicktime 6 API Reference (QT6 API). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

QT6 API discloses information regarding the Quicktime 6 API, including the use of Movie Toolbox data structures (see page 2887). For example, QT6 API discloses that the Movie Toolbox provides a number of functions that allow an application to interact with various media handlers, which are responsible for interpreting and manipulating a media's sample data. Each type of media has its own media handler, which deals with the specific characteristics of the media data (see page 2933). QT6 API also discloses handling movie events (see page 2954).

However, QT6 API fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of wherein the control layer signals the one or more stream sinks that one or more discontinuities exist in one or more media data streams by placing an associated marker in the one or more media data streams, as included in independent claim 1 as amended. Independent claims 23 and 32 have been amended to include similar elements.

Therefore, since QT6 API fails to disclose, or even suggest, each and every element of independent claims 1, 23 and 32, these claims are not anticipated by QT6 API and are allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 6-22 depend from claim 1. Claims 24-26 and 28-31 depend from claim

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/608,869  
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01  
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

23. Claims 33-46 depend from claim 32. As discussed above, claims 1, 23 and 32 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the features recited therein, claims 2-4, 6-22, 24-26, 28-31 and 33-46 are also allowable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-26 and 28-46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) are respectfully requested.

## **2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over QT6 API in view of Dahley et al. (2005/0132408). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, QT6 API fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 23. Dahley et al. fails to cure this defect.

Dahley et al. discloses a system for controlling multiple input devices (see abstract). Dahley et al. discloses that individual devices can be added and removed from the system while the system is running (see paragraph 107). However, Dahley et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of wherein the control layer signals the one or more stream sinks that one or more discontinuities exist in one or more media data streams by placing an associated marker in the one or more media data streams, as included in independent claims 1 and 23 as amended.

Therefore, since QT6 API and Dahley et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 23, these claims are allowable.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Claim 27 depends from claim 23. As discussed above, claims 1 and 23 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 5 and 27 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

## **3. Conclusion**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/608,869  
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01  
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/608,869  
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01  
Filing Date: June 27, 2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: December 29, 2008

By: /Sung T. Kim/

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398  
Attorney for Applicant  
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

December 29, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/608,869  
Attorney Docket Number: 302128.01  
Filing Date: June 27, 2003